

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 194746

71
ORIGIN NEA-10

INFO OCT-01 AF-08 EUR-12 IO-13 ISO-00 PRS-01 H-02 SSM-05

FEA-01 ACDA-10 CIAE-00 INR-07 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-05

EB-07 NRC-07 OES-06 DODE-00 ERDA-07 PA-02 SS-15 SP-02

NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 OC-06 CCO-00 /130 R

DRAFTED BY NEA/P:OJONES:LD

APPROVED BY NEA/P:GFSHERMAN

S/PRS - MR. FUNSETH (INFO)

H- MR. FLATEN (INFO)

EUR/P - MR. JERABEK

IO/P - MR. BLACHLY

SSM - MR. MCANDREW

NEA/ARP - MR. DICKMAN

AF/P - MR. POPE

NEA - MS. GRIFFIN

----- 023904

O 052222Z AUG 76

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY AMMAN IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY BEIRUT IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY DAMASCUS IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY CAIRO IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY TEL AVIV IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY JIDDA IMMEDIATE

AMEMBASSY ALGIERS

USMISSION GENEVA

AMEMBASSY KUWAIT

AMCONSUL DHAHRAN

AMCONSUL JERUSALEM

AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM

AMEMBASSY MANAMA

AMEMBASSY TEHRAN

AMEMBASSY TRIPOLI

AMEMBASSY RABAT

AMEMBASSY LONDON

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 194746

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY ROME

USMISSION USUN NY

USMISSION NATO
AMEMBASSY SANA
AMEMBASSY TUNIS
USINT BAGHDAD
AMEMBASSY DOHA
AMEMBASSY ABU DHABI
AMEMBASSY NOUAKCHOTT
AMEMBASSY MOGADISCIO
USMISSION SINAI
USCINCEUR

UNCLAS STATE 194746

GENEVA FOR MEPC DEL, CINCEUR FOR POLAD

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS:PFOR

SUBJECT:DEPARTMENT PRESS BRIEFING - AUGUST 5, 1976

FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE FOLLOWING ARE EXCERPTS
FROM DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN'S PRESS BRIEFING FOR AUGUST 5,
1976:

ANNOUNCEMENT -- I WOULD LIKE TO READ YOU THE TEXT OF A
STATEMENT ON THE INITIALLING OF U.S. NUCLEAR COOPERATION
AGREEMENTS WITH EGYPT AND ISRAEL. WE PASSED AROUND COPIES,
SO YOU DO NOT HAVE TO TAKE NOTES ON IT. I WILL JUST READ IT
VERY QUICKLY FOR THE RECORD.

"THE NUCLEAR POWER AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND
EGYPT, AND THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL, HAVE NOW BEEN
INITIALLED. THE EGYPTIAN AGREEMENT WAS INITIALLED YESTER-
DAY AFTERNOON, AUGUST 4TH, IN THE DEPARTMENT BY THE
EGYPTIAN CHARGE MOHAMAD EISSA, AND THE ISRAELI AGREEMENT
THIS MORNING, AUGUST 5TH, IN THE DEPARTMENT BY THE ISRAELI
UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 194746

AMBASSADOR, SIMCHA DINITZ. ON THE AMERICAN SIDE, BOTH
AGREEMENTS WERE INITIALLED BY GERARD HELFRICH, DIRECTOR OF THE
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION OF ERDA --
THE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION -- AND
DIXON B. HOYLE, ACTING DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF
STATE FOR THE BUREAU OF OCEANS, INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL

AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS."

NOW, I HAVE OTHER INFORMATION, IF YOU WISH; AND PERHAPS
I WILL JUST VOLUNTEER IT TO SAVE TIME ON THE QUESTIONS.
THE INITIALLING SIGNIFIES AGREEMENT AT THE NEGOTIATING
LEVEL ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE TEXTS, AND THE SIGNATURE OF

THE AGREEMENTS COMES LATER IN THE PROCESS. NOW, AFTER THE INITIALLING, ERDA PREPARES A PACKAGE FOR TRANSMISSION TO THE PRESIDENT. THIS IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT. WE DO NOT KNOW AT THE MOMENT WHEN THAT PROCESS IN ERDA WILL BE COMPLETED, BUT WE BELIEVE IT WOULD BE NO LONGER THAN A FEW WEEKS.

WHEN THE PACKAGE GETS TO THE PRESIDENT, THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT PRESCRIBES THAT THE PRESIDENT'S APPROVAL IS NEEDED FOR THE AGREEMENTS TO BE SIGNED AND THEN SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS FOR A REQUIRED 60-DAY LEGISLATIVE REVIEW. THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT PRESCRIBES THAT THE AGREEMENTS BE SUBMITTED FOR THIS 60-DAY REVIEW. AND THAT THEY BE REFERRED TO THE JOINT ATOMIC ENERGY COMMITTEE FOR A REPORT WITHIN 30 DAYS; AND THEN, SUBSEQUENTLY, THE FULL CONGRESS MAY DISAPPROVE THE AGREEMENTS BY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.

Q. SORRY, FRED --

A. YES.

Q. -- THE DELAY OF 60 DAYS -- IS IT FROM THE INITIALLING OR FROM THE SIGNATURE?

A. FROM SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.

A. THE 60-DAY REVIEW PERIOD, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, BEGINS TO RUN WITH THE SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 194746

Q. IS THAT LEGISLATIVE DAYS, CALENDAR DAYS, OR WHAT?

A. I AM NOT SURE ON THAT, WHETHER IT IS CALENDAR OR LEGISLATIVE DAYS, BUT I WILL CHECK AND GET A CLARIFICATION. PERHAPS WE CAN DO THAT DURING THIS BRIEFING.

Q. AT WHAT POINT DOES THE TEXT OF THIS AGREEMENT BECOME PUBLIC?

A. THE AGREEMENTS BECOME PUBLIC WHEN THEY ARE SIGNED AND SUBMITTED TO THE CONGRESS, AND UNTIL THAT TIME WE ARE REALLY NOT GOING TO BE ABLE TO GIVE THE DETAILS OF THE

AGREEMENTS. THE PRINCIPLES OF THE AGREEMENTS THOUGH, WERE SPELLED OUT IN THE JOINT AMERICAN-EGYPTIAN STATEMENT ON COOPERATION IN THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY, WHICH WAS SIGNED ON NOVEMBER 5TH OF LAST YEAR DURING PRESIDENT SADAT'S VISIT. THE TEXT OF BOTH THE AGREEMENTS -- THE TEXTS ARE IDENTICAL IN CONTENT.

Q. MAYBE YOU CAN SAVE US FROM RESEARCH. SPECIFICALLY, MY RECOLLECTION IS THAT THERE WERE TWO REACTORS FOR ISRAEL

OF 1,970 MEGAWATTS AND ONE FOR EGYPT OF THE SAME SIZE; IS THAT RIGHT?

A. I DO NOT RECALL THE ACTUAL SIZE, WHETHER OR NOT WE EVER STATED PRECISELY WHAT THE SIZES WERE, BUT IF WE HAVE I WILL TRY TO GET THAT.

Q. BUT THERE ARE TWO FOR ISRAEL, ONE FOR EGYPT?

A. I AM NOT SURE OF THAT. I WOULD HAVE TO CHECK ON IT.

Q. FRED, I'M LOST ON THIS QUESTION OF WHERE THE SIGNATURES COME IN BETWEEN THE PARTICIPATING PARTIES. DO THEY COME AFTER CONGRESS HAS ACTED?

A. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THEY COME AFTER.

Q. -- YOU MAY RECALL THAT THERE WAS SOME DELAY SO FAR AS COMPLETING NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE EGYPTIANS. YOU UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 194746

SAY THE TEXTS ARE IDENTICAL.

A. RIGHT.

Q. WERE THERE ANY MAJOR CHANGES MADE OVER THE LAST COUPLE OR THREE WEEKS? -- BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, WE ALL HAD A PRETTY GOOD IDEA OF THE MAIN INGREDIENTS OF THESE AGREEMENTS.

A. THEY WERE SPELLED OUT IN THE PRINCIPLES THAT WERE SIGNED LAST YEAR.

Q. THERE WAS A SLIGHT -- I DON'T KNOW -- DOUBT THAT PERHAPS THERE WAS A LAST MINUTE HITCH, BECAUSE THERE WAS A BIT OF A STRETCH-OUT WITH THE EGYPTIANS. SO CAN YOU TELL US: WERE THERE ANY BASIC CHANGES MADE?

A. I DO NOT KNOW. I HAVE NO INFORMATION AT ALL ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEGOTIATIONS IN RECENT WEEKS--WHAT CHANGES MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE BEEN MADE.

Q. I MEAN SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES, OF COURSE.

A. I DO NOT KNOW.

Q. WELL, CAN YOU TELL US--PICKING UP JIM'S QUESTION BEFORE --THE KIND OF REACTORS, WHAT THESE PROJECTS WILL COST AND WHO WILL PAY FOR THEM--

A. NO.

Q --AND WHEN THEY WILL GET STARTED AND SO FORTH?

A. I CANNOT TELL YOU THAT, BERNIE. I THINK THAT WOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE SUBSTANCE OF THE AGREEMENTS THEMSELVES-- WHICH, AS I SAY, WILL NOT BECOME PUBLIC UNTIL THEY'RE SIGNED. I AM SORRY--THE SIGNING TAKES PLACE PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS. SORRY.

Q. WHAT IS THE RATIONALE--

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 06 STATE 194746

A. TAKES PLACES PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS. I WOULD LIKE THE RECORD CORRECTED ON THAT POINT.

Q. WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR NOT MAKING THIS PUBLIC? THE INITIALLING FIXES THE TEXT OF THE AGREEMENT. PRESUMABLY THE PARTIES AGREE. OTHERWISE THEY WOULDNT HAVE INITIALED IT. IN THE CASE OF THE PNE AGREEMENTS, I BELIEVE THAT THE FULL TEXT WAS MADE PUBLIC.

A. I BELIEVE THAT IS PART OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PARTIES, THAT THEY WOULD NOT MAKE PUBLIC THE TEXTS UNTIL THEY WERE ACTUALLY SIGNED AND SUBMITTED.

Q. THAT'S PART OF IT.

A. I THINK THAT IS PART OF THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS AND THE UNDERSTANDING AND THE PRINCIPLES THAT WERE AGREED ON AT THE BEGINNING OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS.

Q. YOU SAY THE TEXTS ARE IDENTICAL. DO YOU HAPPEN TO KNOW: ARE THERE ANY--WHAT--AMENDMENTS, OR IS THE TEXT THE AGREEMENT--PERIOD?

A. BARRY, THE INFORMATION I HAVE IS THAT THE TWO AGREEMENTS ARE IDENTICAL.

Q. THE AGREEMENTS ARE IDENTICAL.

A. --THE TEXTS, THE SUBSTANCE OF THE AGREEMENTS ARE IDENTICAL AND THEY CONTAIN THE MOST STRINGENT SAFEGUARD OF ANY OF OUR NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Q. SO THE AGREEMENTS, AND WHAT WE MEAN BY AN AGREEMENT-- NOT JUST THE LEGAL DOCUMENT; THE AGREEMENT ITSELF.

A. THE AGREEMENT, YES. WE ARE TALKING ABOUT SUBSTANCE. THE MAIN POINT IS THAT THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE IN THE SUBSTANCE AND THE THRUST OF THE TWO AGREEMENTS.

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 07 STATE 194746

Q. FRED, DOES THAT MEAN THAT THE CAPACITY OF REACTORS FOR EGYPT AND ISRAEL WILL BE THE SAME?

A. I WOULD CONCLUDE THAT THE TOTAL POWER WOULD BE THE SAME SINCE IF THE AGREEMENTS ARE IDENTICAL THAT WOULD IMPLY THAT THEY ARE THE SAME. BUT I AM AFRAID I CANNOT GIVE YOU PRECISION ON THAT. I PRESUME THAT IS THE CASE. OTHERWISE THEY WOULD NOT BE IDENTICAL.

Q. THERE'S BEEN SOME COMMENT ON THESE THINGS ON THE HILL FOLLOWING ASSISTANT SECRETARY ATHERTON'S TESTIMONY SEVERAL DAYS AGO, IN WHICH SENATORS RAISED OBJECTION BECAUSE NEITHER OF THESE COUNTRIES HAS RATIFIED THE NONPROLIFERATION TREATY. AND SOME OF THE SENATORS DON'T THINK THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BE SUPPLYING NUCLEAR REACTORS TO COUNTRIES THAT HAVE NOT AGREED TO FORESWEAR NUCLEAR WEAPONS. WHAT IS THE RESPONSE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT TO THAT LINE OF THINKING?

A. OUR RESPONSE IS THAT THESE TWO AGREEMENTS, AS I HAVE JUST STATED, CONTAIN THE MOST STRINGENT SAFEGUARDS OF ANY AGREEMENT THAT WE HAVE SIGNED WITH A FOREIGN COUNTRY, AND

--

Q. THE SAFEGUARDS ARE SIMPLY DETECTION MATTERS. THEY HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH THE OVERALL POLICY CONCERNS.

A. OBVIOUSLY, THERE IS A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION IN MANY PLACES REGARDING OVERALL POLICY OF THE SAFEGUARDS; AND ALL I CAN SAY IS THAT AN EXTRAORDINARY EFFORT HAS BEEN MADE WITH REGARD TO THESE TWO AGREEMENTS TO MAKE SURE THAT THE

SAFEGUARDS ARE STRINGENT. AS I SAY, THESE ARE THE MOST STRINGENT THAT WE HAVE BEEN ABLE TO NEGOTIATE IN ANY NEGOTIATION REGARDING A NUCLEAR REACTOR.

Q. CAN YOU TELL US HOW THEY'RE STRINGENT AND IN WHAT WAY?

A. NO, I CANNOT. THAT WOULD BE IN THE SUBSTANCE OF THE AGREEMENTS THEMSELVES. THEREFORE, I CANNOT GO INTO THAT.

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 08 STATE 194746

Q. LOOK, IT'S BEEN PUBLISHED, THE NEW YORK TIMES HAS PUBLISHED IT--THE SUBSTANCE OF WHAT THESE AGREEMENTS CALL FOR. WHY DO WE HAVE THIS FOLDER ON WHERE WE CAN'T SAY WHAT IT IS? WE ALL KNOW WHAT IT IS. IT'S BEEN PRINTED.

A. AS FAR AS I KNOW, THE ACTUAL TEXT OF THE AGREEMENTS

HAS NOT BEEN PRINTED.

Q. THE TEXT HASN'T BUT THE SUBSTANCE OF THEM. THE FACT THAT THEY'RE GOING TO HAVE TO REMOVE THE SPENT FUEL FROM THE MIDDLE EAST BEFORE REPROCESSING, THE NUMBERS--THE CAPACITY OF THESE REACTORS--AND A NUMBER OF OTHER THINGS HAVE BEEN PRINTED. THERE'S NO SECRET ABOUT IT.

A. LET US PUT IT THIS WAY: I AM NOT IN A POSITION TODAY TO GO INTO THE SUBSTANCE OF THE AGREEMENTS.

Q. FRED, CAN WE MOVE ON?

A. YES. WELL, THE SAME SUBJECT, OR DO YOU WANT TO--

Q. I BEG YOUR PARDON.

A. LET ME FINISH UP WITH THE SUBJECT BECAUSE I HAVE SOMETHING ELSE TO OFFER AS WELL.

Q. FRED, IT SEEMS TO ME--AND I'D LIKE JUST TO MAKE A POINT OF THIS--THAT WHEN YOU COME OUT AND READ THIS INITIALLY OF THE AGREEMENT--TO PICK UP THE POINT THAT DON IS TALKING ABOUT--IT WOULD BE MOST HELPFUL IF YOU COULD COME OUT WITH SOME OF THE RAW DATA THAT GIVES SOME SHAPE TO WHAT THIS AGREEMENT IS, RATHER THAN HEAR FROM THE PODIUM THAT YOU'RE NOT PREPARED TO DISCUSS THIS AT THIS TIME.

A. I WILL TRY TO GET MORE INFORMATION ON THE SUBSTANCE OF THE AGREEMENTS.

Q. YES. ON THE SAME THING--

A. YES.

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 09 STATE 194746

Q. -- IF YOU COULD CHECK BACK ON THE WORD "IDENTICAL," IT SEEMS--I WOULD THINK TO MOST OF US--THAT THE TEXTS CAN'T BE IDENTICAL AS TO THE AMOUNTS AND NUMBERS OF THINGS THAT THE TWO COUNTRIES ARE GOING TO RECEIVE. I PRESUME THAT MEANS THE SAFEGUARDS ARE IDENTICAL.

A. I AM INFORMED THAT THE AGREEMENTS ARE IDENTICAL IN CONTENT, BUT PERHAPS WE CAN GET MORE INFORMATION ON THAT.

CLARIFICATION OF THE RECORD:

AND LET ME READ ONE MORE THING ON THE QUESTION OF THE LAW OF SIXTY DAYS 'SUBMISSION' TO CONGRESS. THE LAW READS: "SIXTY DAYS WHILE CONGRESS IS IN SESSION." AND THEN THE CLARIFICATION: "IN COMPUTING SUCH SIXTY DAYS; THERE SHALL BE EXCLUDED DAYS ON WHICH EITHER HOUSE IS NOT IN SESSION

BECAUSE OF AN ADJOURNMENT OF MORE THAN THREE DAYS." SO
DURING AN ADJOURNMENT OF ONE OR TWO DAYS, THE SIXTY DAYS
KEEPERS RUNNING. IF IT IS MORE THAN THREE, IT STOPS.
HABIB

UNCLASSIFIED

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 15 SEP 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS, NUCLEAR COOPERATION PROGRAMS, PRESS RELEASES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 AUG 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976STATE194746
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: NEA/P:OJONES:LD
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: D760302-0845
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t197608103/baaaepqv.tel
Line Count: 385
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN NEA
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 8
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ellisooob
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 22 JUL 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <22 JUL 2004 by hattaycs>; APPROVED <27 JUL 2004 by ellisooob>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: PRESS BRIEFING - AUGUST 5, 1976
TAGS: PFOR, TECH, US, IS
To: AMMAN
BEIRUT
DAMASCUS
CAIRO
TEL AVIV
JIDDA

ALGIERS
GENEVA
KUWAIT
DHAHRAN
JERUSALEM
KHARTOUM
MANAMA
TEHRAN
TRIPOLI
RABAT
LONDON
PARIS
MOSCOW
ROME
USUN NY
NATO
SANA
TUNIS
BAGHDAD
DOHA
ABU DHABI
NOUAKCHOTT
MOGADISCIO
SINAI
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006